INCORPORATED, NORTHWEST ARCTIC BOROUGH, NANA REGIONAL

Case No: A04-00049 CV (JWS)

Defendants.

STIPULATION ON WRITTEN DISCOVERY IN KRPC v. TECK COMINCO ALASKA INCORPORATED

BY AND THROUGH THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD, the plaintiffs Enoch Adams, Jr., et al., the defendant Teck Cominco Alaska Incorporated, and the defendant-intervenors NANA Regional Corporation and the Northwest Arctic Borough.

STIPULATION Page 1 of 5

CORPORATION,

Adams et. al. v. Teck Cominco Case No: A04-00049 CV (JWS)

1 of 6

ARTIG RHODES OGE & LEKISCH A PROFESSIONAL A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION TTORNEYS AT LAW 717 K STREET VCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501-3397 TELEPHONE: (907) 276-1592

enter into the following stipulation in the interests of justice and judicial economy. Given that extensive written discovery was propounded in the case of *Kivalina Relocation Planning Committee v. Teck Cominco Alaska Incorporated*, No. A02-231 CV(JWS) ("KRPC litigation"), the parties hereby stipulate as follows:

- 1. The written discovery enumerated below, propounded in the KRPC litigation, shall be deemed discovery propounded and produced in this case, subject to the following three limitations:
- a. Each objection to a discovery request which is the subject of this stipulation, and which objection was raised in the KRPC litigation, shall be deemed to have also been raised and not waived in this litigation.
- b. The parties are not assuming any duty to supplement any responses to the Requests for Production in the KRPC litigation with additional documents that have been generated or discovered after the date of the original response to the Request for Production in the KRPC litigation. If any party wants a Request for Production updated with newly discovered or generated documents, it would need to propound the Request for Production again in this litigation.
- c. The number of interrogatories or other discovery requests propounded in the KRPC litigation will not be included in the total number of discovery requests allowed to each party in this suit.
- 2. Subject to the limitations in paragraph 1, the following prior discovery by KRPC of Teck Cominco is deemed discovery propounded and produced in this case: Request for Admission Nos. 1-10, 15-20, 26-33, 37-38, 40, 42-49, 54-61, 63-65,88, 89-106, 108-113, 200-219, 221-222; Request for Production Nos. 1-122, 124, 128, 131 and 134-135.

HARTIG RHODES
HOGE & LEKISCH
A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
717 K STREET
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
99501-3397
TELEPHONE:
(907) 276-1592
F32.
(907) 277-4352

STIPULATION
Page 2 of 5

Adams et. al. v. Teck Cominco Case No: A04-00049 CV (JWS)

3. Subject to the limitations in paragraph 1, the following prior discovery by KRPC of Teck Cominco is deemed discovery propounded and produced in this case, subject to the further limitation that, because these requests for admissions pertain to DMRs that were supplemented or amended after they were originally submitted to EPA, any use of these admissions in any motion or argument to the Court shall include Teck Cominco's full response (i.e. acknowledge that the Discharge Monitoring Report for that month includes the information in the supplemented or amended DMR): Request for Admission Nos. 11-13, 21, 36 and 107.

- 4. The following prior discovery by KRPC of Teck Cominco is deemed discovery propounded in this case and the attached responses (Attachment "A" to this stipulation) are deemed Teck Cominco's responses to these requests in this case. Request for Admission Nos. 22-25, 34-35, 39, 41, 50-53, 62, 83 and 86.
- 5. Subject to the limitations in paragraph 1, the following prior discovery by KRPC of Teck Cominco is deemed discovery propounded and produced in this case, subject to the further limitation that the admissions may only be used to show the authenticity of the copy of the document that was admitted and no other inference shall be drawn from the Request for Admission itself or from Teck Cominco's response to it: Request for Admission Nos. 76-82 and 114-199.
- 6. Subject to the limitations in paragraph 1, the following prior discovery by Teck Cominco of KRPC is deemed discovery propounded and produced in this case, subject to the further stipulation that the plaintiffs in this litigation adopt KRPC's responses as their own: Request for Admission Nos. 3 and 12-105; Requests for Production Nos. 7, 10-69.

HARTIG RHODES
HOGE & LEKISCH
APROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
717 K STREET
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
99501-3397
TELEPHONE:
(907) 276-1592
FAX:
(907) 277-4352

STIPULATION Page 3 of 5

Adams et. al. v. Teck Cominco Case No: A04-00049 CV (JWS)

June /0, 2005

HARTIG RHODES HOGE & LEKISCH

Larry Hartig

Attorneys for Defendant Teck Cominco Alaska Inc.

June 14, 2005

LANDYE-BENNETT BLUMSTEIN LLP

David-S. Case

Attorneys for Northwest Arctic Borough

June 14, 2005

HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP

James Torgerson

Attorneys for NANA Regional Corporation

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFORE, IT IS SO ORDERED.

HARTIG RHODES
HOGE & LEKISCH
A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
717 K STREET
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
99501-3397
TELEPHONE:
(907) 276-1592
FAX:
(907) 277-4352

JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT

STIPULATION Page 4 of 5 Adams et. al. v. Teck Cominco Case No: A04-00049 CV (JWS)

Exh 1 4 of 6

\triangleright	
June $\underline{\underline{\mathring{O}}}$, 2005	CENTER ON RACE, POVERTY & THE EXVIRONMENT
	Luke W. Cole Attorneys for Plaintiffs Enoch Adams et al.
June, 2005	HARTIG RHODES HOGE & LEKISCH
	Larry Hartig Attorneys for Defendant Teck Cominco Alaska Inc.
June, 2005	LANDYE BENNETT BLUMSTEIN LLP
	David S. Case Attorneys for Northwest Arctic Borough
June, 2005	HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP
•	
	James Torgerson Attorneys for NANA Regional Corporation
GOOD CAUSE APPEARING	3 THEREFORE, IT IS SO ORDERED.
	JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the day of June, 2005 a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served, via First Class Mail, on the below identified parties of

Luke W. Cole Center on Race, Poverty, & the Environment 450 Geary Street, Suite 500 San Francisco, California 94102

Nancy S. Wainwright Law Offices of Nancy S. Wainwright 13030 Back Road, Suite 555 Anchorage, Alaska 99515-3538

James E. Torgerson Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP 510 L Street, Suite 500 Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1959

David S. Case Landye Bennett Blumstein LLP 701 W. 8th Ave., Suite 1200 Anchorage, AK 99501

Hartig Rhodes Hoge & Lekisch PC

F:\Docs\62880\184\PLEADINGS\Stipulation on discovery.doc

HARTIG RHODES
HOGE & LEKISCH
A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
7171 K STREET
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
99501-3397
TELEPHONE:
(907) 276-1592
FAX:
(907) 277-4352

STIPULATION Page 5 of 5

Adams et. al. v. Teck Cominco Case No: A04-00049 CV (JWS)